

From: Roberto Jaramillo [REDACTED]
Date: May 20, 2017 at 11:08:23 AM PDT
To: Mary Aycock <aycock.mary@epa.gov>
Subject: Proposed Plan
Reply-To: Roberto Jaramillo [REDACTED]

Mary,

I, have read the 13 page Proposed Plan EPA has given the community to take into consideration and comment on it as well. I feel what is being

recommended by EPA and other agencies is NOT what our community needs or desires. On page 10 it states on 4.Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and/or

Volume through Treatment: Alternatives 3 and 4 are strictly Pump-and-Treat technologies, which are expected to have **MINIMAL REDUCTION** in toxicity,

mobility, and volume of contaminants in our groundwater. Alternatives 5 and 6 could **POTENTIALLY REDUCE** the toxicity, mobility, and volume through

source treatment by using either **in-situ bioremediation** or **in-situ chemical oxidation**. I, ask EPA why would they recommend and propose that

Alternatives 3 and 4 be the **BEST** solution to consider and has **MINIMAL REDUCTION** in toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants in our groundwater.

I, would ask EPA to take into consideration Alternatives 5 and 6 as these could **POTENTIALLY REDUCE** the the toxicity, mobility, and volume of

contaminants in our groundwater. I know cost is a **BIG** factor and when it comes to Healthy Living it should not be taken into consideration!

I've lived in this community for over 60 years and have seen first what the effects of contaminated water has had on our families, friends, classmates and

coworkers. It has **NOT** been a **VERY** pleasant experience.

I, **HOPE** EPA will do what is **BEST** for the community.

Roberto S. Jaramillo
Community Member